



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

on this subject, in an exhaustive opinion. For the Massachusetts rule see *Warren v. Fitchburg R. R. Co.*, 8 Allen 227.

CORPORATIONS—CONTRACT—CONSIDERATION—EQUITABLE RELIEF.—KENDALL v. KLAPPERTHAL CO. ET AL., 52 ATL. 92 (PA.).—Two corporations were created, owned and managed in the interest of a third corporation. Certain directors of the parent company indorsed notes of one of the others and having paid them, were reimbursed from funds of the original company. *Held*, that their relation was a sufficient consideration to warrant this.

There can be no doubt that directors of a corporation can reimburse themselves for loss from indorsement of its paper; 1 *Moraw., Priv. Corp.*, Sec. 526; 3 *Thompson, Corp.*, Sec. 4069; but an extension of the dictum to accord with the above facts seems contrary to the rule that, unless expressly authorized by charter, one corporation cannot lend its credit to another. *Smith v. Alabama L. Ins. Co.*, 4 Ala. 558. So it was ultra vires for a railroad corporation to guarantee the dividends of an elevator company. 30 *Am. and Eng. R. R. Cas.* 522. The decision in the case in hand rests solely on the basis that, if necessary, courts of equity will look behind the artificial personality to the individuals who compose it. *Rice's Appeal*, 79 Pa. 168; *Gas Co. v. West*, 50 Iowa 16.

DEFECTIVE SIDEWALK—WHAT CONSTITUTES.—BIEBER v. ST. PAUL, 91 N. W. 20 (MINN.).—Plaintiff was injured by slipping on a hexagonal cement block depressed on one edge an inch and a quarter below the level of the sidewalk. *Held*, that this defect was such as to render the city liable for damages. Lewis, J., *dissenting*.

The extent of use of the street is made the test of liability, but the courts generally hold that slight defects will not render the municipality liable. In *Beltz v. Yonkers*, 148 N. Y. 67, for a similar, but more pronounced defect there was no liability. See also *Jackson v. Lansing* (Mich.), 80 N. W. 8; *Morgan v. Lewiston*, 91 Me. 566; *Morris v. Philadelphia*, 45 Atl. 1068 (Pa.), and 24 *Am. and Eng. Enc. Law* 90.

EVIDENCE—DECLARATIONS—PEDIGREE.—WASHINGTON v. THE BANK FOR SAVINGS IN CITY OF NEW YORK, 63 N. E. 831 (N. Y.).—Testimony as to declarations of deceased to the effect that *she had never had any children* was introduced for the purpose of showing that accounts with defendant bank "in trust for son John" and "in trust for son Thomas" were in reality for the benefit of the deceased herself. The testimony was *held* competent as a matter of pedigree.

From the time of *The Bukley Peerage Case*, 4 Camp. 401 (decided in 1811), on, this exception to the rule against the admission of hearsay evidence has been repeatedly recognized both here and in England. *Stein v. Bowman*, 13 Pet. 209; *Eisenlord v. Clum*, 126 N. Y. 552; *Dawson v. Myall*, 45 Minn. 408. While, undoubtedly, the principle involved in declarations as to the existence, or non-existence, of children is the same, nevertheless authorities in support of the latter statement are so rare as to make this decision worthy of notice. See *Buttrick v. Tilden*, 155 Mass. 461.

FOREIGN CORPORATIONS—WHAT CONSTITUTE—REMOVAL OF CAUSES.—CALVERT v. SOUTHERN RY. CO., 41 S. E. 963 (S. C.).—The South Carolina statute fixes conditions under which foreign corporations may become domestic. The